

REMARKS

Claims 1-10 have been allowed. Claim 11 has been canceled. Claims 12-14 are new. Claims 1-10 and 12-14 remain in the application.

Claim 11 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, for failing to comply with the written description requirement. Specifically, the Examiner has stated that the specification does not enabling explain the structure which will “produce for each pulse an isolated traverse through the mode of the laser.” In addition, claim 11 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, for being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which the applicant regards as the invention. Specifically, the Examiner has stated that it is unclear as to which structure is to be encompassed by the term “means for pulsing the laser with short duration pulses to produce for each pulse an isolated traverse through the frequency mode of the laser.”

Applicant has canceled claim 11 and added new claims 12-14. New claims 12-14 are directed to the same subject matter as canceled claim 11.

Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph

Claim 13 depends from claim 12 and includes the claim elements that the Examiner previously rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph. The “means for pulsing” has been replaced with “a pulse laser” to overcome the above rejections. Applicant respectfully submits that support for the pulse laser that is claimed in claim 13 may be found in the specification at, for example, pages 23-24. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw this rejection.

Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph

Claim 14 depends from claim 13 and includes the same claim elements that the Examiner rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph. Applicant respectfully submits that the enabling disclosure for this claim element may be found at, for example, pages 23-24 of the specification. Additionally, Applicant respectfully submits that one skilled in the art would readily recognize that the production of an “isolated traverse through the frequency mode of the laser” is inherent in the operation of the claimed apparatus. Since this claim element was sufficiently described in the specification to convey to one skilled in the art that the Applicant, at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention, the Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw this rejection.

CONCLUSION

In view of the above amendments and remarks, Applicant respectfully asserts that the application is in condition for allowance. Prompt examination and allowance of new claims 12-14 is respectfully requested. Applicant respectfully requests that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case.

Date: January 15, 2004

Respectfully submitted,

DORSEY & WHITNEY LLP

By: _____
Steven R. Pedersen, Reg. No. 53,447
1001 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.
Suite 400 South
Washington, D.C. 20004
Tel. (202) 442-3541
Fax (202) 442-3199